

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

In response to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 8. There appear to be no antecedent basis issues with this claim, which merely limits the pull-down menu of claim 6 to one that is persistent. The specification describes such a pull-down menu at page 4 line 6 and page 8 line 5. The conventional meaning of the word “persistent” cited by the Examiner in paragraph 6 of the Office Action is that intended by Applicants. Applicants invite clarification of the rejection.

In response to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Applicants amend claim 15 to overcome the rejection. The TrackPoint(R) is widely known in the art as an isometric finger-operated computer pointing device typically located between keyboard keys and implemented with balanced bridge strain gauge circuitry. No new matter is added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

In response to paragraph 6 of the Office Action, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 6, 16, and 17 to more clearly define the invention. Remarks below apply to all claims.

Sasaki teaches generating a pull-down menu in a graphical user interface as the Examiner asserts. However, Sasaki does not allow a user to specify preferences as taught and claimed by the present invention. Instead, Sasaki sorts a list of cameras to be controlled “in accordance with the degrees of frequency of use thereof so that the camera names are displayed in a list in order of decreasing frequency of use.” (abstract, column 9 line 65 to column 10 line 15) Alternately, Sasaki can sort the list of cameras “in order of decreasing time over which the cameras have been selected for control” (column 10 lines 38-40) or “the

number of times a camera control command is issued may be counted and the pull-down menu 130 may be displayed in order of decreasing count value” (column 10 lines 42-45).

In contrast, the present invention allows a user to specify preferences regarding available user choices describing electronic commerce transactions by moving labeled items in a pull-down menu, so that relative item positions correspond to relative user preferences. Sasaki does not allow a user to directly specify preferences, and is not directed to electronic commerce at all. Thus, not all elements of the present invention are taught by the cited prior art and the anticipation rejections are overcome.

Regarding dependent claim 2 specifically, Sasaki teaches the automatic determination of whether power is being supplied to a particular camera. Sasaki then responsively does not display pull-down menu items corresponding to such unpowered cameras, or displays them “such that the user can distinguish the camera from one whose power supply is ON.” (Column 12 lines 44-46). However, Sasaki fails to teach enabling a user to delete items representing unacceptable user choices, as taught and claimed by the present invention (page 4 lines 4 and 9, page 6 lines 20-21). Applicants amend claim 2 to clarify this point.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In response to paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 3-5 and 9. The Start Bar in the Windows (R) family of operating systems is well known in the art, but is not related to arranging items in pull-down menus to specify user preferences regarding electronic commerce transactions as stated in the as-amended claims. Thus, the combination of Sasaki and Windows NT fail to each or suggest the present invention, either separately or in combination.

In response to paragraph 9 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 11-12. The JavaScript buttons are not related to arranging items in pull-down menus to specify user preferences regarding electronic commerce transactions as stated in the as-amended claims. Thus, the combination of Sasaki and JavaScript Buttons to each or suggest the present invention, either separately or in combination.

In response to paragraph 10 of the Office Action, Applicants amend claim 14; claim 13 is canceled herein and its limitations incorporated into the independent claims to more clearly define the invention.

All pending claims are believed to be allowable as amended. The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's undersigned representative if a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Shanmugasundaram Ravikumar et al.

By Marc D. McSwain
Marc D. McSwain (#44,929)
Phone (408) 927-3364